2000

The Cultural Sensitivity of Pre-service Teachers: Measuring the Degree to Which Teachers Are Prepared to Work With Diverse Populations

Teresa A. Freking
Eastern Illinois University

THESIS/FIELD EXPERIENCE PAPER REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

_____ 5/11/00

Author's Signature Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Author's Signature Date

thesis4.form

The Cultural Sensitivity of Pre-service Teachers:

Measuring the Degree to Which Teachers Are Prepared to Work With Diverse Populations

BY

Teresa A. Freking

THESIS

SUMBITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2000

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5-10-00
DATE

THESIS DIRECTOR

5-10-00
DATE

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL HEAD

Signatures

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLIING
THIS PART OF THE SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION DEGREE

5-05-00
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

5/9/00
DATE

THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER

Abstract

A study was conducted of 39 pre-service teachers regarding their level of cultural sensitivity. Participants completed a 26-item inventory adapted from the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory created by Henry (1985). The results suggest that a multicultural field experience may have a slight positive effect on the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers, however, this effect seems to be limited in degree and specific to certain response types. A general, positive effect on the overall cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers is not supported in this study. The results of the second part of the study indicate that pre-service teachers today self-report they are more culturally sensitive than their counterparts reported ten years ago.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to my mother Edna, my father Duane, and my grandmama Teresa who instilled within me the value of and commitment to education.

Acknowledgments

A special thank you to Dr. Judith Lyles, Dr. Lynda Kayser and Dr. Katherine Wickstrom for their support and guidance. An additional thanks to Dr. Dawn VanGunten who served as my informal advisor and motivator on this project.

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables

The Cultural Sensitivity of Pre-service Teachers: Measuring the Degree to Which Teachers Are Prepared to Work With Diverse Populations

In recent decades there have been two consistent demographic predictions for American education. The first is that the student population in the U.S. will become increasingly diverse in terms of ethnic/racial backgrounds, socioeconomic status and non-native language backgrounds. The second is that the overall American teacher population will remain relatively homogeneous, maintaining a teaching pool that is around 90% white, 75% female (U.S. Department of Education, 1997), and predominantly middle class and monolingual in English (Zimpher, 1989).

In the early 1990s, students of color made up around 30% of the school population (Grant & Secada, 1990). Based on U.S. Census data, it is projected that by the year 2000, students of color will make up 35.1% of the total population. By 2050, the projected population of students of color will grow to 56.1% (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992). However, the current teaching force is not only failing to keep pace with the growth in diversity in the student population, but it actually may be becoming less diverse. For example, in 1983 Black (non-Hispanic) public school teachers made up 11.5% of the teaching force (Harris & Harris, 1987). By the 1993-94 school year, only 9% of the public school teaching force was Black (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). In 1996, this number had fallen to 7.3% (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). When examining the demographics for all non-White public school teachers, the situation shows a similar decline. Between 1991 and 1996, the number of non-white public school teachers dropped by almost 30%, from 13.2% in 1991 to 9.3% in 1996 (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

Zimpher (1989) reported results from a longitudinal study sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) that involved 2700 prospective teachers at the elementary and secondary levels. The data indicated that in the foreseeable future the teaching pool will be overwhelmingly White, female, middle class, monolingual, from a rural (small town) or suburban community and will have limited intercultural experience. According to Gomez (1994), there is "an undisputed mismatch in the race, social class, and language background between many teachers and their students in the U.S.A." (p. 320). It seems clear that public school teachers will be increasingly interacting with students who have backgrounds different from their own.

Some may question the actual significance of a mismatch in the backgrounds of teachers and students in the U.S., yet numerous studies support reason for concern. Larke (1990) noted that non-minority prospective teachers reported they felt uncomfortable in settings with people who exhibit values and beliefs different than their own. Furthermore, almost half of these prospective teachers preferred to work with children and parents whose cultures were similar to their own. A 1990 AACTE study reported that a clear majority of pre-service teachers indicated a desire to teach students in a "majority" (White) setting as opposed to a "minority" (non-White) setting. Zimpher (1989) found that the typical teacher candidate is not only from a suburban or rural hometown, but also prefers to teach in a community like the one in which she grew up. Zimpher found that only 15% of prospective teachers would like to teach in urban settings even though the greatest need is found in those areas.

Gomez (1994) studied how race, social class, sexual preferences and language backgrounds of novice teachers affect their perspectives on teaching "other people's"

children. She found that many novice teachers blame children's learning and achievement problems on the consequences of children's home lives, not on their own beliefs about and behaviors toward children in school. She suggests that a mismatch in teacher and student backgrounds increases these misperceptions, leading teachers to blame the students for their problems and to deny their own power to help students with their problems. Zeichner and Hoeft (1996) reported that some prospective teachers view student diversity as a problem rather than a resource.

Grant and Secada (1990) state that since the release of the Coleman Report (1966) during the Civil Rights Movement, the general population has been aware of the barriers and challenges facing diverse student populations. Yet, Law and Lane (1987) suggest that the attitudes of teachers toward students of diverse backgrounds have not changed significantly in the past six decades. In their study, they examined attitudes of the general population toward persons of diverse backgrounds with attitudinal data that was collected over six decades. They found that pre-service teachers' attitudes toward persons of ethnic and national groups were no more accepting in 1987 when they completed their study than expressed by the general population six decades earlier. In their study, Law and Lane surveyed 141 pre-service teachers' multicultural attitudes using the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The scale measures a person's willingness to recognize, live near, or be associated with people from different groups (Bogardus, 1967). Law and Lane compared their data with national samples taken by Bogardus and his colleagues between 1926 and 1977.

More recently, Christine Bennett (1995) points to the growing concern in the current high-stakes, standards-based education movement. She concludes that many

teachers are not yet prepared to effectively assist racial and language minority students to achieve high levels of academic excellence. Indeed, Larke (1990) reported that studies have shown that a high correlation exists among educators' sensitivity, knowledge and application of cultural awareness information and minority students' successful academic performance (Banks, 1987; Gollnick & Chinn, 1986; Sleeter & Grant, 1988).

These studies support concern for the growing disparity between the backgrounds of public school teachers and their public school students. The question that must be asked in relation to this disparity is the following-- Do all students have an equal chance to succeed in our current educational system? One area that must be examined is the teacher's role in regard to this question. It seems only logical that a teaching force with a significantly different background from the student population, combined with teacher training that fails to significantly change negative attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, will create and maintain a system that does not provide equality of opportunity for all students to learn.

For many, the situation described here merits a "call to arms" for multicultural education. As Melnick and Zeichner (1995) state:

> Although the vast inequities in U.S. society cannot be attributed to the failure of schools, the failure of schools to provide quality education for all students represents a crisis in education that is intolerable in a democratic society.(p. 2)

Goodlad (1990) suggested this in his proposal for educational reform stating that education efforts "must be infused with understanding of and commitment to the moral obligation of teachers to ensure equitable access to and engagement in the best possible

K-12 education for all children and youths" (p. 292). Consequently, the push to reform education seems to be largely aimed at teacher education programs charged with the responsibility of preparing the future teachers of America.

Literature Review

Multicultural Education Typologies

Most scholars and researchers agree that the term multicultural education generally refers to the idea that all students should have an equal opportunity to learn and be successful in schools, colleges and universities. Banks (1992) states, "The need for multicultural education is based on the assumption that some students from certain gender, racial, and social class groups have a better opportunity to experience success in schools, colleges, and universities as they are currently structured than do students from other groups" (p. 870). Grant and Ladson-Billings (1997) point out that the term is both a philosophical concept and an educational process. As a philosophical concept it is built on the ideals of freedom, justice and equality. As a process, it advocates preparing students to strive for equality in all institutions. It encourages the development of healthy self-concepts and identities especially in relation to students' multiple group memberships. Multicultural education advocates the perspective of viewing diversity as a strength and encourages multicultural awareness and sensitivity on the part of all members in society.

In recent years, multicultural education typologies have been proposed by Banks (1994), Sleeter and Grant (1988) and others (Gibson, 1976; Pratte, 1983). Banks describes three major approaches to multicultural education: curriculum content,

achievement and intergroup education. Curriculum content approaches focus on adding and changing the content of curriculum to incorporate groups that have been ignored. It demands that the curriculum in various content areas, such as the social sciences, the language arts, and the sciences, include the contributions, perspectives, and experiences of all groups. Multicultural education in curriculum content approaches is conceptualized as an educational process. Achievement approaches conceptualize multicultural education as a set of goals, theories or strategies that are aimed at increasing the achievement of lower class students, students of color, females and students with disabilities. Examples of programs that focus on achievement approaches include early childhood intervention programs such as Head Start, and school-based family involvement programs. Intergroup education approaches focus on helping all students develop more positive attitudes toward people from different cultural, racial and gender groups. Increasing interactive opportunities between students of different backgrounds is a means of creating more positive attitudes among all students. The use of cooperative learning strategies in a classroom to encourage interaction between students would be an example of these types of approaches (Banks, 1994).

Sleeter and Grant (1988) take a somewhat broader perspective and delineate five approaches to multicultural education. The first approach, Teaching the Exceptional and Culturally Different, focuses on preparing all students-- especially students of color, students from low-income groups, and students with disabilities-- to achieve within the existing school structure and society. Although teachers may adapt some of their own teaching, their main goal is to help students to adapt and change to be successful. The second approach, the Human Relations approach, focuses on appreciating and respecting

differences. Often, the emphasis in this approach is to encourage relations between those of different backgrounds to gain understanding and develop respect. If successful, intercultural relations will improve and social equality will result. The third approach, Single-Group Studies, emphasizes the study of groups that have been largely ignored in the mainstream curriculum. This approach seeks to identify the oppression the group has experienced and the accomplishments that, in many cases, have not been acknowledged in the mainstream curriculum. The fourth approach, Multicultural Education, combines aspects of the first three approaches. However, it differs in that it attempts to change the existing school structure and process to provide equal opportunity for all students. The fifth approach is entitled Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist. This final approach addresses the goal of changing not just the school to achieve equitable access for all students, but the society itself.

History of Multicultural Education

As early as 1969, numerous scholars pointed to the failure of teacher education programs to prepare teachers to teach students from diverse backgrounds (Smith, 1969). Although teacher education programs seemed to be doing a good job of educating prospective teachers to teach students who were similar to themselves (primarily white and middle class), most teacher education programs had a monocultural approach (O'Brian, 1969). For this reason, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and other organizations began focusing on this issue in the 1970s. By 1977, NCATE required member institutions to have a multicultural component in teacher education programs (Banks, 1992*)*. In 1979, NCATE required that accredited schools show planning for multicultural education and in 1981, the first multicultural

education standard was created. By 1990, NCATE had integrated multicultural components into four different standards yet few institutions were in full compliance with these standards in the first years (Gollnick, 1991). In the most recent draft of the NCATE 2000 standards, NCATE is proposing to reduce the number of standards focusing on multicultural education and return to one standard that specifically addresses diversity (NCATE, 2000). Standard 4 for the proposed NCATE 2000 Unit Standards currently states:

> The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools. (p. 2)

Although the format of NCATE's multicultural standards has changed over the past 25 years, NCATE has clearly and consistently indicated that multicultural education should be an integral part of teacher education programs.

It is generally accepted that the multicultural education movement began in the 1960s. In the early years, multicultural education in some teacher education programs advocated a human relations approach that encouraged students to focus on developing positive attitudes and feelings toward students of diverse backgrounds. Advocates of this approach believed that social equality will result if we are knowledgeable and respectful of each other and their differences (Banks, 1994). The state of Iowa adopted this approach when it mandated a human relations course for all its teacher education program students in 1980 (Andrews & Andrews, 1998).

In higher education institutions, new courses and programs also became popular as a means of achieving the goals of multicultural education throughout the university setting. As early as the 1960s and 1970s, some higher education institutions created new ethnic studies and women's studies programs in order to incorporate diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives. Some institutions even established an ethnic studies course requirement for all of their undergraduates.

Similarly, in recent years many teacher education programs have also instituted requirements that include coursework in multiculturalism in compliance with NCATE's standards. As of 1998, forty-one states had requirements in the study of cultural diversity in order to earn the initial elementary or secondary teaching certificate (Andrews & Andrews, 1998). In some schools and colleges of education, this approach is viewed as the major vehicle for achieving multicultural education knowledge, values, attitudes and skills for their prospective teachers. Sometimes, multicultural coursework is found as a single course and in some states is mandated by law. For example, the states of Illinois and Indiana require that all students take a multicultural education course in their teacher education programs in order to earn state certification (Andrews & Andrews, 1998).

Zeichner and Hoeft (1996) offered a helpful distinction regarding how multicultural education is incorporated into teacher education programs. They classified multicultural education in teacher education programs into two types—infused or segregated. According to Zeichner and Hoeft, infused programs integrate cultural diversity throughout the program's courses and field experiences while segregated programs tend to treat cultural diversity as a focus of a single course or as a topic in a few courses. Although many scholars advocate a more infused approach, the dominant model

in use in most teacher education programs is the segregated approach (Garibaldi, 1992). However, Ladson-Billings (1995) argues that a single course, whether it be in human relations, ethnic studies, or multicultural education, is not adequate to prepare teachers for the challenges they will face. She points out that an individual, separate course or an add-on component to the current teacher education program sends a message that multicultural concerns are not real concerns of teaching or learning, just additional institutional hoops that must be achieved.

Research on the effectiveness of the single course approach has not been encouraging. Martin and Koppelman (1988) found that the effect of multicultural instruction in a separate multicultural course alone may lead to some short term positive effects in changes of attitude. However in another study, Henington (1981) found that attitude gains from a single multicultural course were lost within only one month. Others have found that an isolated course is insufficient to change attitudes and knowledge of pre-service teachers (Larke, 1990; VanGunten, 1995). In a review of empirical studies on the multicultural education programs of pre-service teachers, Grant and Secada (1990) noted a lack of empirical studies. They reviewed 16 studies, most which adopted a segregated approach that examined program effectiveness. They found only one study that reported clear, positive results while the remaining studies reported mixed results.

Melnick and Zeichner (1995) sum up the research of these types of segregated approaches stating that there is no conclusive evidence in the literature related to the long term impact of these strategies on teachers and their practices or on teacher education institutions and their faculties. Sleeter (1988) agrees:

> Including a relatively small amount of multicultural training in students' pre-service programs probably does not have much impact on what they do. It may give them a greater repertoire of teaching strategies to use with culturally diverse students, and it may alert them to the importance of maintaining high expectations. For significant reform of teaching to occur, however, this intervention alone is insufficient. (p. 29)

The Focus on Field Experiences in a Culturally Diverse Environment

With the questionable impact of single course efforts to prepare teachers to teach students of backgrounds different from their own, the newest thrust in preparing teachers multiculturally has focused on including or adding field experiences to the teacher education curriculum. These field experiences go beyond what has been done in other clinical experiences because it usually places students directly in a multicultural environment. The proponents of field experiences have been many. Deering and Stanutz (1995) point to the previous research of Blanchard and Cook (1976) and Wu and Shaffer (1987) as supporting the use of field experiences in changing attitudes and behaviors. Bennett (1995) asserts that students must have authentic field experiences in culturally diverse settings over an extended period of time. Boyle and Sleeter (1996) state that field experiences with representatives from diverse populations are vital to developing understandings that are multicultural. Grant and Secada (1990) agree that these experiences are worthwhile for teachers. Garibaldi (1992) believes that field experiences with a variety of students and schools should be assigned every semester throughout the teacher education program. Nieto and Rolón (1997) state that because the majority of teachers will be required to work with a diverse student population, institutions which

prepare teachers have a moral obligation to offer practicum experiences that center on diverse populations.

However, Zeichner (1980) warned against the tendency for educators and lay people to unquestioningly assume all field-based experiences to be useful and beneficial. He pointed out that state mandates such as the 100 clock hours required for all pre-service teachers in Illinois are questionable because the literature on field-based experiences does not support the contention that all field experiences are necessarily beneficial. More time spent in the classroom alone will not automatically make better teachers. As John Dewey (1938) wrote, "It is not enough to insist upon the necessity of experience, not even the activity in experience. Everything depends upon the quality of experience which is had" (p. 27).

In regard to multicultural field experiences, the sentiment about the quality of field experiences is equally cautioning. Some critique current field experiences in multicultural settings as lacking in meaning and not set up to be useful in developing understandings that are multicultural (Bennett, 1995; Boyle-Bayse, 1996). Zeichner (1980) goes further in arguing that the student teaching practicum as it is currently structured may actually undermine the student's learning. He concludes that it is the quality of the experience that is of paramount importance.

Currently, most programs seeking to prepare prospective teachers do require at least some field experience, but programs vary widely as to what types of experiences are required, the duration of experience and the amount of accompanying instruction, and whether the field experience includes a multicultural component. Increasingly, states are stepping in and regulating teacher education programs including their multicultural field

experiences (Ladson-Billings, 1995). The state of Illinois currently requires teacher candidates to have field experiences with children of diverse cultures (Andrews & Andrews, 1998). Georgia requires that all field experiences have a multicultural component while California requires that one-half of the student teaching experience must be with students who are culturally different from the student teacher (Andrews & Andrews, 1998). Although the intent of such mandates are clearly meant to be supportive of multicultural education, the hurried implementation of a program to meet a state mandate may lead to programs being put into place without much preparation and, therefore, without the quality that is clearly called for in the literature (Zeichner, 1980).

Indeed, the nature and composition of the multicultural field experience in teacher education programs vary widely from institution to institution. It ranges from brief experiences associated with particular courses (Tran, Young & DiLella, 1994) to full-scale immersion experiences living in and teaching in culturally different communities (Mahan, 1982). One type of field experience that has gained recent attention is a multicultural field experience outside of the traditional school environment. Community-based organizations and other more informal settings outside of the school environment have been used to offer multicultural experiences. A number of educators have suggested that these experiences should supplement the field experiences within the traditional school environment. For teacher educators trying to prepare prospective teachers for a multicultural school environment, there are two questions that must be addressed. First, what type of multicultural field experience is most effective and second, how should multicultural field experiences be incorporated into the student's program?

The research does appear to offer some suggestions. Deering and Stanutz (1995) found that a single field experience without accompanying coursework does not significantly increase the cultural sensitivity of high school pre-service teachers. This concurs with Sleeter's (1985) review of the literature measuring multicultural education program effectiveness. She noted that one course did not seem to be enough to make lasting gains, but programs that combined coursework with a field experience produced better gains than programs without field experiences or field experiences alone. Nelson (1998) found that student teachers who had significant interactions or relationships with people of different cultural backgrounds in their lives, even if that interaction was participation in an urban field experience, were more open to working in urban schools. She also noted that for students who had previous coursework, the field experience could serve to enrich the information they had already received.

The focus of this study was to examine how teacher education programs are helping to prepare future teachers to work successfully with students from backgrounds different from their own. Specifically, the study examined the effects of a multicultural field experience on the cultural sensitivity of elementary pre-service teachers using an adapted version of the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI) created by Henry (1985). The second purpose of the study was to compare the results of this study with the results of a similar study conducted ten years earlier by Larke (1990). Larke examined the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers after the completion of a multicultural course. Similar to this study, Larke used the CDAI created by Henry (1985). Participants in Larke's study were primarily female, White and from middle class backgrounds. Larke found that an isolated course is insufficient to change attitudes and

behaviors of pre-service teachers to "appreciate, accept and respect the diversity of students facing them in future classrooms" (p. 29).

For the purposes of this study the term pre-service teacher refers to a student who is enrolled in a teacher education program, but has not completed the student teaching component that is typically found at the end of the student's teacher education program. The term multicultural education refers to educational practices that are directed toward race, culture, language, social class, gender, and disability. Cultural diversity (or culturally different) is used to refer to the differences among people specifically in relation to race, ethnicity, language, social class, gender, and disability.

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the cultural sensitivity of elementary pre-service teachers toward students who are culturally different than the teacher. Two research questions were addressed:

1) Will the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers increase as a result of completing a multicultural field experience?
2) How does the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers today compare with pre-service teachers ten years ago?

Methodology

Thirty-nine pre-service teachers participated in this study. Each participant took a pre-test of the adapted version of the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI) prior to completing a field experience in a diverse setting. After completing the experience, the participants took an identical post-test in order to determine if any changes occurred as a result of the field experience in a diverse setting.

Participants

Participants in this study included 5 males and 34 females attending a Midwestern state university in a rural town. All participants were seeking elementary and/or middle-level certification. All of the participants indicated their ethnic group to be White/Caucasian-American. Of the thirty-nine subjects, thirty-six were undergraduates including twenty-eight seniors, 7 juniors, and 1 sophomore. Three subjects were pursuing their teacher education certification post-baccalaureate. Although all students reported they would be certified to teach at the elementary level, 7 were seeking specialization in special education and 3 in middle-level education. Thirty-seven of the students were traditional college age falling between the ages of 20 to 24. Two were over the age of 37. Both of the non-traditional age college students were men with a baccalaureate degree. All of the subjects were planning to complete their student teaching in the fall or spring of the next academic school year.

The participants of the study were enrolled in a section of a practicum course taught by one of two different professors. The course's curriculum was jointly created by the two professors and included three seminars with written reflections and assignments throughout the week. The first seminar was an orientation to the course and the last two seminars included reflective discussion related to students' multicultural experiences. Assignments included fourteen written observations on assigned topics, one personal reflection, one journal article reflection and a 2-3 page final project.

The multicultural field experience was a weeklong 25 hour field experience held during the interim session between spring and summer sessions. The title of the course was Multicultural/Disabilities Practicum and students were placed for their field

experiences in four elementary schools and two middle schools. All placements were made in two cities with populations of 34,000 and 84,000 approximately 90 minutes from the university. The six schools reflected minority populations of between 33% and 45%.

Instrument

The CDAI created by Henry (1985) was used in a similar study by Larke (1990). The adapted version of the CDAI had only minor changes from the original created by Henry. It was a 26-item questionnaire, with a five response Likert scale that measured an individual's attitudes, beliefs, and self-reported behavior toward children of culturally diverse backgrounds. Although Henry (1985) used categories regarding attitudes about sense of responsibility, discomfort, adaptations and accommodations, this study will employ a categorization strategy identical to that used by Larke (1990). Larke categorized responses regarding attitudes about general cultural awareness, the culturally diverse family, cross-cultural communication, assessment, and creating a multicultural environment using multicultural methods and materials. Based on subsequent research by Henry (1991), content and construct validity for the instrument has been established. Cronbach's test for internal consistency for reliability yielded an overall alpha coefficient of .90. Test-retest reliability for the entire test was .66. However, Henry determined that 2 of the 28 questions should not be included in the inventory in their present form due to low test-retest reliability. Therefore, the adapted version for this study did not include questions 26 and 27 from the CDAI.

Procedure

At the first seminar meeting, the researcher met with both classes and briefly described the study and asked students to sign a consent form to participate (see Appendix A). All students agreed to participate in the study. All participants completed a survey adapted from the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (Henry, 1985) at the first seminar meeting and at the last seminar meeting after completing all of their field experience hours (see Appendix B). The questionnaire was administered by the researcher of this study during the first seminar meeting before any pre-service teachers had an opportunity to interact with students or teachers at their field experience sites. A written script was used including brief verbal directions. The post-test was administered by the researcher for one section and by one of the professors for the second section due to the fact that both seminars were held at the same time in two different cities.

Results

In order to determine whether the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers increased as a result of completing a multicultural field experience, a paired sample t-test was conducted for each of the five attitudes response areas: general cultural awareness, the culturally diverse family, cross-cultural communication, assessment, and creating a multicultural environment using multicultural methods and materials. Paired sample t-tests were used to determine whether significant differences were found in each of the five categories from the pre-test to the post-test. Results are reported in Table 1. A pre-test/post-test paired sample t-test found no significant differences in the areas of general cultural awareness, the culturally diverse family, cross-cultural communication and

creating a multicultural environment using multicultural methods and materials. In the area of assessment, a significant difference was found at the .05 level of significance.

Table 1

Paired Sample T-tests for Pre-test/Post-test Results

Response Category	Number (N)	Mean (X)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	(t)	Significance (2-tailed)
Cultural Awareness	39	-.1026	.5065	38	-1.265	.214
Culturally Diverse Family	39	1.954E-02	.4763	38	.256	.799
Cross-Cultural Communication	39	.0000	.5620	38	.000	1.00
Assessment	39	2521	.6235	38	2.526	.016
Creating a Multicultural Environment	39	2.198E-02	.3319	38	.414	.682

Descriptive statistics were used to compare the results of individual survey questions from the pre-test to the post-test. Descriptive statistics for each question are reported in Tables 2 – 6. Each table corresponds with the five attitude response categories previously identified. The data include both number and percentage figures for subjects who strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed or were neutral. For the purposes of reporting the data in this section, we will examine the percentages of subjects who agreed (by indicating strongly agree or agree), disagreed (by indicating strongly disagree or disagree) and were neutral. The first category, Cultural Awareness, consisted of five questions (see Table 2). Descriptive statistical analysis of the data

Table 2

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Pre-Test and Post-Test for the Cultural Awareness Response Category

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
1. ...my culture to be different from some of the children I will serve.	SA	19(48.7)	25(64.1)
	A	18(46.2)	10(25.6)
	N	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
	D	1(2.6)	3(7.7)
	SD	0(0)	0(0)
2. ...it is important to identify immediately the ethnic groups of the children I will serve.	SA	14(35.9)	9(23.1)
	A	17(43.6)	21(53.8)
	N	6(15.4)	5(12.8)
	D	2(5.1)	4(10.3)
	SD	0(0)	0(0)
3. ...I would prefer to work with children and parents whose cultures are similar to mine.	SA	2(5.1)	1 (2.6)
	A	7(17.9)	4(10.3)
	N	20(51.3)	13(33.3)
	D	7(17.9)	20(51.3)
	SD	3(7.7)	1(2.6)
5. ...I am uncomfortable in settings with people who exhibit values or beliefs different from my own.	SA	0(0)	2(5.1)
	A	3(7.7)	3(7.7)
	N	8(20.5)	7(17.9)
	D	24(61.5)	22(56.4)
	SD	4(10.3)	5(12.8)
7. ...I am sometimes surprised when members of certain ethnic groups contribute to particular school activities (e.g., bilingual students on the debate team or Black students in the orchestra).	SA	0(0)	0(0)
	A	2(5.1)	1(2.6)
	N	5(12.8)	4(10.3)
	D	24(61.5)	25(64.1)
	SD	8(20.5)	9(23.1)

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

indicated somewhat contradictory findings in this area. The data showed that 94.9% of subjects on the pre-test and 89.7% on the post-test agreed that they would teach children who did not share their cultural background. When asked about the importance of identifying the ethnic group of the children you serve, 79.5% in the pre-test and 76.9% in the post-test agreed it is important. Over 25% on the pre-test and 53.9% on the post-test disagreed that they would prefer to work with children and parents whose cultures were similar to their own. In response to the question addressing feelings of discomfort working in settings with people who exhibit different values or beliefs, 7.7% on the pre-test and 12.8% on the post-test, agreed they would feel uncomfortable. When asked if they are sometimes surprised at minority participation in traditional non-minority school activities, only 5.1% agreed in the pre-test and 2.6% in the post-test. Descriptive statistical results in this attitude category indicated small changes in both positive and negative directions on individual questions, although the question about preferring to work with children and parents who were similar showed a larger change than any of the other questions.

The second category, The Culturally Diverse Family consisted of seven questions (see Table 3). Reponses related to whether teachers should establish parent interactions outside of school activities indicated that 76.9% on the pre-test and 69.2% on the post-test, agreed. All subjects on the pre-test and 97.4% on the post-test agreed that it is necessary to include parent input in program planning. In the pre- and post-tests, no subjects disagreed with this statement. Similarly, the majority of subjects on the pre-test (87.1%) and post-test (76.9%) agreed that scheduling IEP meetings or program planning should be at the convenience of the parents.

Table 3

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Pre-Test and Post-Test for the Culturally Diverse Family Response Category

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
6. ...other than the required school activities, my interactions with parents should include social events, meeting in public places (e.g., shopping centers), or telephone conversations.	SA	8(20.5)	14(35.9)
	A	22(56.4)	13(33.3)
	N	3(7.7)	5(12.8)
	D	5(12.8)	4(10.3)
	SD	1(2.6)	3(7.7)
8. ...the family's views of school and society should be included in the school's yearly program planning.	SA	6(15.8)	11(28.2)
	A	22(57.9)	21(53.8)
	N	7(18.4)	6(15.4)
	D	3(7.9)	0(0)
	SD	0(0)	1(2.6)
9. ...it is necessary to include on-going parent input in program planning.	SA	15(38.4)	17(43.6)
	A	24(61.5)	21(53.8)
	N	0(0)	1(2.6)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
	SD	0(0)	0(0)
10. ...I will sometimes experience frustration when conducting conferences with parents whose culture is different from my own.	SA	0(0)	4(10.3)
	A	21(53.8)	14(35.9)
	N	7(17.9)	9(23.1)
	D	10(25.6)	11(28.2)
	SD	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
15. ...in asking families of diverse cultures how they wish to be referred to (e.g., Caucasian, White, Anglo) at the beginning of our interaction.	SA	5(12.8)	7(17.9)
	A	13(33.3)	12(30.8)
	N	11(28.2)	9(23.1)
	D	8(20.5)	8(20.5)
	SD	2(5.1)	3(7.7)
21. ...parents know little about assessing their own children's academic performance.	SA	0(0)	1(2.6)
	A	7(17.9)	3(7.7)
	N	6(15.4)	14(35.9)
	D	25(64.1)	18(46.2)
	SD	1(2.6)	3(7.7)

(table continues)

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
24. ...Individualized Education Program	SA	7(17.9)	8(20.5)
	A	27(69.2)	22(56.4)
meetings or program planning should be	N	4(10.3)	7(17.9)
	D	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
scheduled for the convenience of the parent.	SD	0(0)	1(2.6)

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

Data examining whether the family's views of school and society should be included in the school's yearly program planning showed that 73.7% on the pre-test and 82% on the post-test, agreed with this statement. When asked if they felt they would experience frustration when conducting conferences with parents from different cultural backgrounds, 53.8% on the pre-test and 46.2% on the post-test agreed. Furthermore, almost one-fourth of students in the post-test were neutral on this question. In the question about assessing children, 17.9% on the pre-test and 10.3% on the post-test, agreed with the statement that "parents know little about assessing their own children." About 46.1% on the pre-test and 48.7% on the post-test felt that teachers should ask families their preferred ethnic identification (e.g. Caucasian, White, Anglo).

In the third category addressing cross-cultural communication (see Table 4), responses showed that 23% of subjects on the pre-test and 20.5% on the post-test believed that they would be uncomfortable in settings with people who speak non-standard English. In the question regarding non-standard English, only 41.1% on the pre-test and 43.6% on the post-test, agreed that sometimes non-standard English should be ignored. Furthermore, over one-third of respondents on both tests were neutral on this issue. A few students, 12.9% on the pre-test and 15.4% on the post-test, felt that a

student's spoken language should be corrected by modeling without explanation. A majority on the pre-test (69.3%) and on the post-test (66.7%), disagreed with this statement. In response to the question as to whether English should be taught as a second language to non-English speaking children as part of the regular curriculum, 76.9% on the pre-test and 71.7% on the post-test, agreed. In the category of Cross-Cultural Communication, three of the four questions showed slight positive gains.

Table 4

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Pre-Test and Post-Test for the Cross-Cultural Response Category

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
4. ...I would be uncomfortable in settings	SA	2(5.1)	2(5.1)
	A	7(17.9)	6(15.4)
with people who speak non-standard	N	11(28.2)	10(25.6)
	D	14(35.9)	19(48.7)
English.	SD	5(12.8)	2(5.1)
12. ...English should be taught as a second	SA	7(17.9)	7(17.9)
	A	23(59.0)	21(53.9)
language to non-English speaking children	N	7(17.9)	9(23.1)
	D	2(5.1)	2(5.1)
as a regular part of the school curriculum.	SD	0(0)	0(0)
13. ...when correcting a child's spoken	SA	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
	A	4(10.3)	5(12.8)
language, one should role model without	N	7(17.9)	7(17.9)
	D	23(59.0)	18(46.2)
any further explanation.	SD	4(10.3)	8(20.5)
14. ...that there are times when the use of	SA	1(2.6)	4(10.3)
	A	15(38.5)	13(33.3)
non-standard English should be ignored.	N	14(35.9)	13(33.3)
	D	8(20.5)	8(20.5)
	SD	1(2.6)	1(2.6)

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

Data examining assessment (see Table 5) indicated that 28.2% on the pre-test and 17.9% on the post-test agreed that a child should be referred for testing if learning difficulties appear to be cultural or language differences. When examining adaptations in assessments, 35.9% on the pre-test and 25.6% on the post-test believed that adaptations in standardized assessments were questionable since they alter reliability or validity. Approximately one-third of subjects were neutral on this assessment issue. When considering whether translating a standardized achievement or intelligence test to the child's dominant language gives the child an added advantage, only 12.8% on the pre-test and 10.5% on the post-test, agreed. In this category, all questions showed positive gains.

Table 5

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Pre-Test and Post-Test for the Assessment Response Category

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
18. ...a child should be referred for testing if learning difficulties appear to be due to cultural differences or language differences.	SA	1(2.6)	0(0)
	A	10(25.6)	7(17.9)
	N	12(30.8)	14(35.9)
	D	14(35.9)	13(33.3)
	SD	2(5.1)	5(12.8)
19. ...adaptations in standardized assessments to be questionable since they alter reliability and validity.	SA	3(7.7)	2(5.1)
	A	11(28.2)	8(20.5)
	N	16(41.0)	13(33.3)
	D	9(23.1)	13(33.3)
	SD	0(0)	3(7.7)
20. ...translating a standardized achievement or intelligence test to the child's dominant language gives the child an added advantage that does not allow for peer comparison.	SA	0(0)	1(2.6)
	A	5(12.8)	3(7.9)
	N	6(15.4)	5(13.2)
	D	20(51.3)	17(44.7)
	SD	8(20.5)	12(31.6)

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

In the final category, Creating a Multicultural Environment, respondents indicated how they would create a multicultural environment using multicultural methods and materials (see Table 6). When asked how they felt about ethnic jokes and phrases in the classroom, 5.1% on the pre-test and 0% on the post-test reported they would accept their use in the classroom. A minority of respondents on the pre-test (12.9%) and post-test (5.1 %) reported that they will sometimes ignore racial statements. When asked whether the solution to communication problems of certain ethnic groups is the child's responsibility, only 2.6% on the pre-test and 5.1% on the post-test, agreed the responsibility rested with the student alone. Only 2.6% of respondents on both tests disagreed with the statement that teachers should provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences. In response to whether teachers should make program adaptations to accommodate diversity, a clear majority on the pre-test (97.4%) and post-test (89.7%), agreed. However, only 82% on the post-test disagreed with the statement that the teaching of ethnic customs and traditions of many cultures is NOT the school's responsibility. This was down from 87.2% on the pre-test. When asked if the teacher's knowledge of a particular culture should affect their expectations of the children's performance, only 25.7% on the pre-test and 28.2% on the post-test agreed. Around 20% of respondents were neutral on this point in the pre-test and post-test. Results in this response category indicated both positive and negative changes for individual questions.

Table 6

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Pre-Test and Post-Test for the Creating a Multicultural Environment Response Category

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
11. ...the solution to communication problems of certain ethnic groups is the child's own responsibility.	SA	0(0)	0(0)
	A	1(2.6)	2(5.1)
	N	3(7.7)	1(2.6)
	D	24(61.5)	26(66.7)
	SD	11(28.2)	10(25.6)
16. ...in a society with as many racial groups as the United States, I would expect and accept the use of ethnic jokes or phrases by some children.	SA	0(0)	0(0)
	A	2(5.1)	0(0)
	N	3(7.7)	1(2.6)
	D	17(43.6)	20(51.3)
	SD	17(43.6)	18(46.2)
17. ...that there are times when racial statements should be ignored.	SA	1(2.6)	0(0)
	A	4(10.3)	2(5.1)
	N	3(7.7)	7(17.9)
	D	20(51.3)	16(41.0)
	SD	11(28.2)	14(39.9)
22. ...that the teaching of ethnic customs and traditions of many cultures is NOT the responsibility of public school programs and personnel.	SA	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
	A	1(2.6)	1(2.6)
	N	3(7.7)	5(12.8)
	D	30(76.9)	25(64.1)
	SD	4(10.3)	7(17.9)
23. ...it is my responsibility to provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences in foods, dress, family life and/or beliefs	SA	10(25.6)	11(28.2)
	A	28(71.8)	23(59.0)
	N	0(0)	4(10.3)
	D	1(2.6)	0(0)
	SD	0(0)	1(2.6)

(table continues)

Stem: I believe...		Pre-Test	Post-Test
25. ...I should make adaptations in programming to accommodate the different cultures as my enrollment changes.	SA	8(20.5)	11(28.2)
	A	30(76.9)	24(61.5)
	N	1(2.6)	4(10.3)
	D	0(0)	0(0)
	SD	0(0)	0(0)
28. ...my knowledge of a particular culture should affect my expectations of children's performance.	SA	1(2.6)	2(5.1)
	A	9(23.1)	9(23.1)
	N	9(23.1)	8(20.5)
	D	16(41.0)	11(28.2)
	SD	4(10.3)	9(23.1)

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

Discussion

Question 1: Will the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers increase as the result of completing a multicultural field experience.

This study found limited statistical significance to support the contention that a multicultural field experience increases cultural sensitivity. The paired sample t-tests with a pre-post test design indicated that only the area of assessment was found to be significant at $p < .05$ level. However, using percentages to compare results, there were instances of positive change between pre- and post-tests on certain individual questions of notable mention. On the question addressing one's preference to work with children and parents who share one's culture, the pre-test indicated that 23% agreed with this statement while on the post-test, this dropped to 12.9%. On the same question, the number of respondents disagreeing with this statement rose from 26% on the pre-test to 54% on the post-test. Interestingly, on the pre-test, 51% of respondents reported that they

were neutral on this topic and on the post-test this number dropped to 33%. It seems that this experience may have had the effect of convincing some students that it would be acceptable to work in environments with students and parents who did not share their own culture. On the question that addresses whether prospective teachers would expect and accept the use of ethnic jokes or phrases by some children in the classroom, the pre-test found that 13% agreed with or were neutral on this statement. At the post-test, there were no pre-service teachers who agreed with this statement and only 2.6% of students remained neutral.

It is important to note that some results in individual questions indicated that there may have been slight negative effects from the pre-test to the post-test. For example, in the question regarding whether the teacher should provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences, only 2.6% disagreed or were neutral on this topic in the pre-test. However, at the post-test, 13% disagreed or were neutral.

These results seem to indicate that a field experience in a multicultural setting may have a slight positive effect on the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers. However, this effect seems to be limited in degree and specific to certain areas and questions. Therefore, it does not appear to be a general, positive effect on the overall cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers.

The lack of convincing results on the impact of a multicultural field experience on pre-service teachers leads to the consideration of a number of issues that may have affected the effectiveness of the experience. First, the structure of the multicultural field experience may have been a factor in the effectiveness of the experience. Although this field experience involved 25 clock hours, the hours were completed in the span of only

one week. Therefore, relationships between the pre-service teacher and the children were short-lived. Children may have viewed the pre-service teachers as merely visitors and it is unlikely their relationships were developed as deeply as they would have been if their experiences were spread out over a number of weeks with the same students. In a similar vein, the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the pre-service teacher may have been equally limited. Each cooperating teacher makes the decision of how much to include the pre-service teacher in the class and in discussion of issues related to working with diverse students. In such a short time span, it may be difficult to develop a level of comfort and trust with a pre-service teacher reducing the overall effects of the experience.

Second, the multicultural field experience is a special course held during the intersession occurring between the spring and summer sessions. It is completed as a separate and isolated component from the rest of the pre-service teacher's education program. This encourages the experience to be viewed as a separate add-on component and de-values it by keeping it outside of the "regular" curriculum. The message that students might take is that the experience is merely a state or institutional mandate that must be met in order to earn certification. Certainly, this subtle message is perceived by some students and may influence their attitudes and learning from the situation.

Third, as noted in previous research, the quality of experience is the single most important aspect of any field experience. An important component in learning how to work with students from diverse backgrounds is observing teachers who are modeling successful relationships with students. Teachers who demonstrate their commitment to multicultural education in their curriculum and in their teaching techniques and strategies, add an equally important component. However, as in many cases, cooperating teachers

for field experiences and in some cases even student teaching, are chosen solely on the basis of whether they want to work with pre-service teachers. This is partially the fault of teacher education institutions that offer few incentives to cooperating teachers to be involved with pre-service teachers. The end result is that the cooperating teachers who work with pre-service students are self-selected and may or may not be modeling good multicultural pedagogy and effective relationships with all students.

Question 2: How does the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers today compare with that of students ten years ago?

The second purpose of this study was to compare the results on the adapted version of the CDAI in this study with the results of participants on the CDAI in a similar study conducted 10 years ago by Patricia Larke (1990). In both studies, an almost identical CDAI (1985) was administered to the participants with only minor changes. A comparison of subjects is appropriate for the following reasons. Subject populations in both studies were all pre-service elementary teachers. An overwhelming majority of subjects were Euro-American (100% current study/90% Larke study) and female (95% current study/100% Larke study). Most subjects in both studies were from middle to upper socio-economic status backgrounds, had completed at least three years of undergraduate coursework and had taken one multicultural education course. The subject pool was similar in size (N=39 current study/N=51 Larke study). Subjects differed significantly in their geographical region (Midwest for the current study/South for the Larke study) and in institutional differences in teacher education program preparation. For purposes of a more similar comparison to this study, we will examine the data from the current study before the field experience was completed, as Larke's study did not

include a multicultural field experience. Therefore, the comparison will be made between the pre-test data from this study (prior to the field experience) to the post-test only data presented in Larke's study.

In comparing results of the current study to those of Larke's (1990), there were some notable, even remarkable, differences in all categories. Although all of the results are included in Table 7, only a brief description of several will be included here. In the area of cultural awareness, the majority of subjects in Larke's study (69%) reported they would be uncomfortable working with people having different values. In the current study, less than 10% agreed with this statement. In the question regarding being surprised at minority participation in traditional non-minority school activities, 88% in Larke's study agreed with this statement compared with only 5.1% in the present study. A clear majority in Larke's study (79%) agreed that parents know little about assessing their own children. This contrasts with only 18% in the current study. In the question addressing their acceptance of the use of ethnic jokes and phrases by children, over three-fourths of subjects in Larke's study agreed they would accept them where only 5% of the current study agreed to their acceptance in the classroom.

In knowledge of assessment, the majority of subjects in Larke's study (67%) indicated that they agreed with the statement that students should be referred for testing if learning difficulties appear to be cultural or language differences. Only 28% of participants in the current study agreed with that statement. In regard to whether giving a standardized or intelligence test in the child's dominant language provides an unfair advantage, 69% of respondents in Larke's study agreed compared to 13 % in this study.

Table 7

N and Cumulative Percentage Frequencies for Comparison of Results of Current Study with Larke's (1990) Study

Item	Strongly Agree & Agree N(%)		Strongly Disagree & Disagree N(%)		Neutral N(%)	
	Current	Larke	Current	Larke	Current	Larke
Cultural Awareness						
1. Cultural differences between the teacher and student	37(94.9)	46(90.2)	1(02.6)	2(03.9)	1(02.6)	3(05.9)
2. Identify students by ethnic groups	31(79.5)	47(92.2)	2(05.1)	2(03.9)	6(15.4)	2(03.9)
3. Prefer to work with students who share my culture	9(23.0)	22(43.1)	10(25.6)	11(21.6)	20(51.3)	18(35.3)
5. Uncomfortable with people who have values different from me	3(07.7)	35(68.6)	28(71.8)	6(11.8)	8(20.5)	10(19.6)
7. Surprised at minority participation in traditional non-minority school activities	2(05.1)	46(88.3)	32(82.0)	2(03.9)	5(12.8)	4(07.8)
The Culturally Diverse Family						
6. Teachers should establish parent interactions outside school activities	30(76.9)	39(76.5)	6(15.4)	5(09.8)	3(07.7)	7(13.7)
8. Should include family view of school and society in school program planning	28(73.7)	43(84.3)	3(07.9)	3(05.9)	7(18.4)	5(09.8)
9. Necessary to include parent input in program planning	39(100)	46(90.2)	0(00.0)	1(02.0)	0(00.0)	4(07.8)
10. Experience frustrations in conferences with parents of different cultures	21(53.8)	17(34.0)	11(28.2)	7(14.0)	7(17.9)	26(52.0)
15. During initial meetings, teachers should ask families their preference for ethnic identification	18(46.1)	23(45.1)	10(25.6)	12(23.5)	11(28.2)	16(31.4)
21. Parents know little about assessing their own children	7(17.9)	35(78.6)	29(66.7)	7(13.8)	6(15.4)	9(17.6)
24. Schedule IEP conference or program planning at the parent's convenience	34(87.1)	42(82.4)	1(02.6)	0(02.0)	4(10.3)	8(15.7)

(table continues)

Item	Strongly Agree & Agree N(%)		Strongly Disagree & Disagree N(%)		Neutral N(%)	
	Current	Larke	Current	Larke	Current	Larke
Cross Cultural Communication						
4. Uncomfortable with people who speak non-standard English	9(23.0)	23(45.1)	19(48.7)	12(23.5)	11(28.2)	16(31.4)
12. Regular curriculum should include ESL for non-English speaking children	30(76.9)	46(90.2)	2(05.1)	2(03.9)	7(17.9)	3(05.9)
13. Students' spoken language should be corrected by modeling without explanation	5(12.9)	25(49.0)	27(69.3)	12(23.5)	7(17.9)	14(27.5)
14. Sometimes non-standard English should be ignored	16(41.1)	5(09.8)	9(23.1)	40(78.5)	14(35.9)	6(11.8)
Assessment						
18. Students should be referred for testing if learning difficulties appear to be cultural or language differences	11(28.2)	34(66.6)	16(41.0)	8(15.7)	12(30.2)	9(17.6)
19. Adaptations in standardized assessments to be questionable, alters reliability and validity	14(35.9)	16(32.0)	9(23.1)	22(44.0)	16(41.0)	12(24.0)
20. Standardized or intelligence test in child's dominant language gives unfair advantage	5(12.8)	35(68.6)	28(71.8)	14(27.4)	6(15.4)	2(03.9)
Creating a Multicultural Environment Using Multicultural Methods and Materials						
11. Solution to communication problems of certain ethnic groups is child's own responsibility	1(02.6)	0(0.00)	35(89.7)	50(98.0)	3(07.0)	1(02.0)
16. Accept the use of ethnic jokes/phrases by children	2(05.1)	39(76.5)	34(87.2)	8(15.7)	3(07.7)	4(07.8)
17. Sometimes ignore racial statements	5(12.9)	24(47.0)	31(79.5)	21(41.2)	3(07.7)	6(11.8)
23. Teachers should provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences	38(97.4)	50(98.0)	1(02.6)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	1(02.0)
25. Teachers should make program adaptation to accommodate diversity	38(97.4)	43(84.3)	0(0.00)	3(05.9)	1(02.6)	5(09.8)
28. Cultural knowledge should affect teacher expectation	10(25.7)	20(39.2)	20(51.3)	25(49.0)	9(23.1)	6(11.8)

Note. Questions 26 and 27 are not included in the table because both questions were removed from the adapted version of the CDAI based on subsequent research by Henry (1991). Question 22 is not included in the table because Larke (1990) omitted it from the data published in 1990.

Although caution must be used in comparing two different populations from two different studies, these results suggest that pre-service teachers today self-report that they are more culturally sensitive than their counterparts of ten years ago. There are several possible interpretations that can be made from these results. Most optimistically, these results might be an indication that current multicultural efforts in teacher education programs are making a difference in terms of affecting the attitudes of pre-service teachers and are creating teachers who are more culturally sensitive than in the past. However, it is important to note that one of the limitations of this study was the use of a self-reported attitude survey to indicate attitude change. It is important to clarify that although it appears that self-reported attitudes may have changed, one can not generalize this to mean that the "true" attitudes or behaviors of pre-service teachers have changed. An equally plausible interpretation of these results then is that students today may be more aware of what they are supposed to report or what is politically correct to report. They may simply be more knowledgeable about what is perceived as the "multicultural viewpoint" and savvy about responding accordingly. It is also possible that the current environment of teacher education programs is not as accepting of views that are not multiculturally friendly and, therefore, pre-service teachers have learned to hide their true feelings.

Limitations

It is important to note that there are several limitations of this study that must be considered. First, this study included a relatively small number of participants (n=39) who were primarily female, White and from the same geographical region of the country. Results, therefore, can not be generalized to other populations. Secondly, the instrument

being used in this study is an attitude survey. As Deering and Stanutz (1995) warned in their research, attitude surveys do not necessarily influence or predict actual behaviors. They state that the research on the influence of attitudes on behavior is mixed. They point to research conducted by Rose and Jamieson (1991) which suggests that people are wise to the questions asked on surveys and, therefore, distort their real attitudes when expressing them. On the other hand, in a review of the research, Wu and Shaffer (1987) concluded that attitudes formed through experience tend to be more thoughtfully developed and stable than attitudes formed in other ways. However, there is clearly a missing link between attitudes and behaviors that calls for the necessity of examining the *behavior* of pre-service teachers as well as their self-reported attitudes.

A third limitation of this study is that the findings regarding the effectiveness of a multicultural experience on the cultural sensitivity of pre-service teachers only measure the short-term immediate effects of a multicultural experience. No follow-up study will be conducted to determine if any gains made on certain questions are still evident after a number of months.

A fourth limitation of this study is the lack of a control group in which to compare the treatment (multicultural field experience) group. Not including a control group failed to eliminate the possibility that gains in some areas may have resulted from other factors. Merely taking a pre-test survey and bringing one's awareness to an issue in the pre-test could cause a change in the post-test results as well as other factors such as differences in life experiences or time of year.

A final limitation of this type of research is that without an experimental design, it is only possible to examine relationships between variables. Causation can not be determined.

Conclusions

Educational equity in the classroom has not been achieved in our schools and pre-service teachers will continue to need help to prepare to work with all students successfully. The fact that organizations such as NCATE encourage multicultural experiences and many states require coursework and field experiences in a multicultural setting, affirms that educators and legislators are cognizant and supportive of helping to prepare teachers to achieve equity. However, although many multicultural education field experiences are in place in teacher education programs, there is a lack of research that helps institutions make important decisions about how to implement a successful field experience. More research needs to be conducted identifying the most effective structure of multicultural field experiences including issues such as the length and the intensity of the experience as well as the nature of the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the pre-service teacher. In addition, more studies need to assess program effectiveness using behavioral data to document change as opposed to attitudinal self-report data. What pre-service teachers do once they actually get into the classroom is the most important question in this research, yet few studies attempt to tackle this issue. One exception was a study conducted by Mahan (1982). Mahan's research examined outcomes of an intensive cultural immersion field experience for student teachers in Navajo and Hopi schools in New Mexico. Mahan found positive data on numerous variables including supervising teacher evaluations, employment success of project

participants and principal's evaluations of the acceptance of student teachers in the Navajo and Hopi schools.

Finally, this study and the many studies that have been done in the past years on the effectiveness of multicultural education efforts have led to one very clear conclusion. Raising cultural sensitivity and changing behaviors of prospective teachers is a daunting task. As many have suggested before, formal multicultural courses and multicultural experiences must be only one component of the effort to change attitudes and behaviors of prospective teachers. It is naïve of educators, administrators, and politicians to believe that a course or a few courses-- even with a multicultural field experience-- will be able to significantly change attitudes, beliefs, values and behaviors that have been created and reinforced over 20 or more years of life experiences. Although teacher education programs do play an important role in the process of changing attitudes and behaviors, there are many other forces at work. Teacher education programs must insist on a more integrated approach of multicultural education that encompasses the entire university community. The idea of creating a course or two that will be sufficient to prepare our pre-service students to effectively teach students of all backgrounds has found little support in the research. Clearly, a more comprehensive approach including field experiences and integration of multicultural perspectives must be included in all university coursework, not just teacher education coursework.

Bibliography

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1990). AACTE/Metropolitan life survey of teacher education students. Washington, DC: Author.

Andrews, T. E., & Andrews, L. (Eds.) (1998). The NASDTEC manual on the preparation and certification of educational personnel: 1998-1999 (4th ed.). National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education & Certification: Author.

Banks, J. A. (1987). Multiethnic education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1991). Teaching multicultural literacy to teachers. Teaching Education, 4(1), 135-144.

Banks, J. A. (1992). History of multicultural education. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (6th ed., Vol. 3). New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Multi-ethnic education: Theory and practice (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennett, C. I. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(4), 259-265.

Blanchard, F. A., & Cook, S. W. (1976). Effects of helping a less competent member of a cooperating interracial group on the development of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(6), 1245-1255.

Bogardus, E. S. (1967). A forty-year racial distance study. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.

Boyle-Baise, M. & Sleeter, C.E. (1996). Field experiences: Planting seeds and pulling weeds. In C. A. Grant & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom (pp. 371-388). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F.O., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Deering, T. E. & Stanutz, A. (1995). Pre-service field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. Journal of Teacher Education, 46(5), 390-394.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Macmillan.

Garibaldi, A. M., (1992). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse classrooms. In M. E. Dilworth (Ed.), Diversity in teacher education: New expectations (pp. 23-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gibson, M. A., (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 7, 7-18.

Gollnick, D. (1991). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In C. Grant (Ed.), Research and multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream (pp. 218-239). London: Falmer Press.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1986). Multicultural education in pluralistic society. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Gomez, M. L. (1994). Teacher education reform and prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching "other people's" children. Teaching & Teaching Education 10(3), 319-334.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, C. A. (1997). Critical knowledge, skills, and experiences for the instruction of culturally diverse students: A perspective for the preparation of pre-service teachers. In Jacqueline Jordan Irvine (Ed.), Critical Knowledge for Diverse Teachers & Learners (pp. 1-26). Washington, DC: AACTE Publications USA.

Grant, C. A., & Ladson-Billings, G. (Eds.). (1997). Dictionary of multicultural education. Phoenix, AZ: Onyx Press.

Grant, C. A. & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 403-422). New York: MacMillan.

Harris, S., & Harris, J. B. (1987). The teacher's almanac: 1997-1998. New York: Facts on File Publications.

Henington, M. (1981). Effects of intensive multicultural, non-sexist instruction on secondary student teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 6(1), 65-75.

Henry, G. (1985). Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory. Hampton, VA: Hampton University Mainstreaming Outreach Project.

Henry, G. (1991). Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory. Hampton, VA: Hampton University Mainstreaming Outreach Project.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. Banks (Ed.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp.747-759). New York: MacMillan.

Larke, P. J. (1990). Cultural diversity awareness inventory: Assessing the sensitivity of pre-service teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 12(3), 23-30.

Law, S. G., & Lane, D. S., Jr. (1987). Multicultural acceptance by teacher education students: A survey of attitudes toward 32 ethnic and national groups and a comparison with 60 years of data. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 14(1), 3-9.

Mahan, J. M. (1982). Native Americans as teacher trainers: Anatomy and outcomes of a cultural immersion project. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 2(2), 100-110.

Martin, R. J., & Koppelman, K. (1991 or 1988). The impact of a human relations/multicultural education course on the attitudes of prospective teachers. The Journal of Intergroup Relations, 18(1), 16-27.

Melnick, S. L., & Zeichner, K. M. (1995). Teacher education for cultural diversity: Enhancing the capacity of teacher education institutions to address diversity issues. (NCRTL-RR-95-4). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (Eric Document Reproduction Service no. ED392 751)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2000). NCATE 2000 standards revision. [on-line]. Available Internet: http://www.ncate.org/2000/2000stds.pdf.

Nelson, R. (1998). The impact of urban and suburban field placements on student teachers' cultural awareness. College Student Journal, 32(4), 566-571.

Nieto, S. & Rolón, C. (1997). Preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners (pp. 89-123). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

O'Brian, J. (1969). A master's degree program for the preparation of teachers of disadvantaged youth. In J. O'Brian & B. W. Tuckman (Eds.), Preparing to teach the disadvantaged (pp. 167-242). New York: Free Press.

Pratte, R. (1983). Multicultural education: Four normative arguments. Educational Theory, 33, 21-32.

Roesen N. J., & Jamisson, D. W. (1991, August). Twenty years of bogus pipeline research: Review of meta-analysis. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association convention.

Sleeter, C. E. (1985). A need for research on pre-service teacher education for mainstreaming and multicultural education. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5(3), 205-215.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1988). Making choices for multicultural education: Five apporaches to race, class and gender. Macmillan Publishing Company: New York.

Smith, B. O. (1969). Teachers for the real world. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Tran, M. T., Young, R. C., & Dilella, J. D. (1994). Multicultural education courses and the student teacher: Eliminating stereotypical attitudes in our ethnically diverse classroom. Journal of Teacher Education, 45(3), 183-189.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, (1992). Current Population Reports, P-25-1092, Population projections of the United States, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1992-2050. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). America's teachers: Profile of a profession, 1993-94. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). Digest of education statistics 1998. Washington, DC: Author.

VanGunten, D. M. (1995). A study of pre-service teachers' attitudes regarding issues of diversity: A challenge for transformative pedagogues. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Toledo, Ohio.

Wu, C. & Shaffer, D. R. (1987). Susceptibility to persuasive appeals as a function of source credibility and prior experience with the attitude behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(4), 677-688.

Zeichner, K. M. (1980) Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in pre-service teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 45-55.

Zeichner, K. M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed., pp527-547). New York: MacMillan.

Zimpher, N. L. 91989). The RATE project: A profile of teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(6), 27-31.

Appendix A

Informed Consent
Eastern Illinois University

Investigator: Teresa A. Freking
Assistant Professor
Department of Secondary Education and Foundations

You have been invited with no obligation to participate in an investigation to determine student attitudes. You must be enrolled as a student at Eastern Illinois University in STG 3000 during intersession. All information requested will be collected within the meeting times scheduled for this course. You are under no obligation at all to complete the surveys. Your decision whether to participate or not will not interfere with your future relations with Eastern Illinois University or the investigator of the study.

Explanation of the study: This survey is designed to investigate and explore pre-service teacher's attitudes about teaching.

Risks and discomforts associated with the study: There are no risks involved with participation in this study.

Confidentiality: The information obtained from these surveys will be confidential and will only be reported in statistical analysis with no connections made to you. Identification of data will be done by number only.

Authorization

You are making a decision whether or not to participate, having read the information provided above, and based on the fact that all questions have been answered to your satisfaction.

Date _____ Time_____

Participant's Signature _____

I hereby certify that I have given an explanation to the above individual of the study and its risks and potential complications.

Principal Investigator _____

Appendix B

Introduction:

This self-examination questionnaire is designed to assist the user in looking at his/her own attitudes, beliefs and behavior towards young children of culturally diverse backgrounds. There are no "right" answers, only what you believe.

Demographic Data – Circle the most appropriate response in each area below.

1. Gender
   Male Female

2. Academic Status

   Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Post-Baccalaureate

3. Academic Major (circle all that apply):

   Elementary /Early Childhood

   Special Education

   Middle Level

   Other (please specify) _____

4. Ethnic Group

   African American

   Asian

   Caucasian/White

   Hispanic

   Native American

   Other (please specify) _____

5. Age

   17-19 20-24 25-30 31-36 37 and over

Checklist: Use the scale below to reflect your beliefs about the following statements. Please circle the letter of the answer that best applies.

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

I BELIEVE...

1. ... my culture to be different from some of the children I will serve.

   A B C D E

2. ...it is important to identify immediately the ethnic groups of the children I will serve.

   A B C D E

3. ...I would prefer to work with children and parents whose cultures are similar to mine.

   A B C D E

4. ...I would be uncomfortable in settings with people who speak non-standard English.

   A B C D E

5. ...I am uncomfortable in settings with people who exhibit values or beliefs different from my own.

   A B C D E

6. ...other than the required school activities, my interactions with parents should include social events, meeting in public places (e.g., shopping centers), or telephone conversations.

   A B C D E

7. ...I am sometimes surprised when members of certain ethnic groups contribute to particular school activities (e.g., bilingual students on the debate team or Black students in the orchestra).

   A B C D E

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

I BELIEVE...

8. ...the family's views of school and society should be included in the school's yearly program planning.

A B C D E

9. ...it is necessary to include on-going parent input in program planning.

A B C D E

10. ...I will sometimes experience frustration when conducting conferences with parents whose culture is different from my own.

A B C D E

11. ...the solution to communication problems of certain ethnic groups is the child's own responsibility.

A B C D E

12. ...English should be taught as a second language to non-English speaking children as a regular part of the school curriculum.

A B C D E

13. ...when correcting a child's spoken language, one should role model without any further explanation.

A B C D E

14. ...that there are times when the use of non-standard English should be ignored.

A B C D E

15. ... in asking families of diverse cultures how they wish to be referred to (e.g., Caucasian, White, Anglo) at the beginning of our interaction.

A B C D E

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

I BELIEVE...

16. ...in a society with as many racial groups as the United States, I would expect and accept the use of ethnic jokes or phrases by some children.

A B C D E

17. ...that there are times when racial statements should be ignored.

A B C D E

18. ...a child should be referred for testing if learning difficulties appear to be due to cultural differences and/or language.

A B C D E

19. ...adaptations in standardized assessments to be questionable since they alter reliability and validity.

A B C D E

20. ...translating a standardized achievement or intelligence test to the child's dominant language gives the child an added advantage and does not allow for peer comparison.

A B C D E

21. ...parents know little about assessing their own children's academic performance.

A B C D E

22. ...that the teaching of ethnic customs and traditions of many cultures is NOT the responsibility of public school programs and personnel.

A B C D E

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

I BELIEVE...

23. ...it is my responsibility to provide opportunities for children to share cultural differences in foods, dress, family life and/or beliefs.

A B C D E

24. ...Individualized Education Program meetings or program planning should be scheduled for the convenience of the parent.

A B C D E

25. ...I should make adaptations in programming to accommodate the different cultures as my enrollment changes.

A B C D E

26. ...my knowledge of a particular culture should affect my expectations of the children's performance.

A B C D E

Adapted from the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI; Henry, 1985)